

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

$$\begin{array}{c}) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \end{array}$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{pmatrix}$$

9

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 On January 29, 2002, Appellant appealed to the Director of the Department of Personnel (DOP). In his
2 letter of appeal, Appellant requested that his position be reallocated to the Information Technology
3 Systems Specialist III classification.

4 The Director's designee, Kari Lade, conducted an allocation review of Appellant's position and
5 forwarded the results of her review to Teri Thompson, Director of Classification and Compensation. By
6 letter dated May 20, 2002, Ms. Thompson notified Appellant that his position was properly allocated to
7 the Information Technology Systems Specialist II classification. On June 19, 2002, Appellant filed
8 exceptions to the Director's determination with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions
9 are the subject of this proceeding.

10
11 Appellant works in the Library Systems Department for CWU's Library. In part, Appellant is
12 responsible for hardware and software support for library staff; database development and maintenance;
13 system-level software administration including installing software; installing and configuring hardware
14 and peripheral devices; and consulting with and training staff using the library systems. Appellant
15 works independently to complete his day-to-day duties and responsibilities and consults with the
16 network administrator for setting up and installing equipment. CWU's library system encompasses
17 satellite locations off campus and multiple locations on the main campus. Staff, students and members
18 of the public use the system. Appellant's supervisor is the Electronic Resources and Systems Librarian.
19 However, Appellant consults with a network administrator, whose work area is not located in the
20 library, to coordinate setting up library equipment or connecting equipment to the Novell Server.

21 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that he works independently; is responsible for
22 equipment installation, problem identification and resolution; his duties come through his supervisor but
23 are initiated by staff, the network administrator and his supervisor; conducts needs assessments; and
24 consults with vendors. Appellant asserts that his assignments are complex and involve technical support
25 for a 24-hour, 7 day a week system that services the entire campus community. In addition, Appellant
26

1 argues that he acts as the network administrator when the administrator is absent. Appellant asserts that
2 his position should be allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist III classification.

3 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent contends that the Director's determination is
4 supported by a preponderance of the evidence and is consistent with the findings of CWU's internal
5 review committees and the decision of human resources staff. Respondent asserts that Appellant's
6 position is properly allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist II classification.

7
8 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position was properly allocated
9 to the Information Technology Systems Specialist II classification should be affirmed.

10 **Relevant Classifications.** Information Technology Systems Specialist II, class code 2406; Information
11 Technology Systems Specialist III, class code 2407.

12
13 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
14 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
15 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that work
16 is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in similar
17 positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular position to
18 the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class which best
19 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State
20 University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

21
22 Positions allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist (ITSS) II classification perform
23 recurring duties and responsibilities in analyzing customer needs, installing equipment and software,
24 resolving day-to-day problems, and providing user training. ITSS IIs operate within guidelines to
25 perform standard computer support services. ITSS IIs have a limited scope of responsibility, have
26 limited authority for making decisions, and refer complex problems to higher levels. The duties of

1 Appellant's position fit within this classification, however, the scope of his responsibilities and his level
2 of independence go beyond the ITSS II classification.

3 Positions allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist III classification work
4 independently, consult with users, complete assignments and coordinate projects, and resolve problems.
5 ITSS IIIs have a moderate scope of responsibility and their work impacts internal or satellite operations,
6 multiple users, or more than one group. At this level, complex problems are resolved by consulting with
7 a higher level. Appellant works independently. His work involves satellite and multiple locations and
8 impacts staff, students and members of the public. In addition, Appellant consults with a higher-level
9 network administrator for the limited purpose of coordinating installations. The scope of Appellant's
10 responsibilities and his level of independence fit the ITSS III classification.

11
12 **Conclusion.** Appellant's appeal on exceptions should be granted and Appellant's position should be
13 allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist III classification.

14
15 **ORDER**

16 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of Sergio Razo is granted, the
17 Director's determination is reversed, and Appellant's position is allocated to the Information
18 Technology Systems Specialist III classification.

19 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2002.

20
21 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

22 _____
23 Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

24 _____
25 René Ewing, Member